

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	ا
08/544,212	10/17/1995	DAVID A. RUSSO	01222.0034	4603	
22002	590 10/29/2002	SOW GARRETT &	EXAM	INER	7
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW			BRUNSMAN, DAVID M		
WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER]52
			1755		

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- -
Advisory Action	08/544,212	RUSSO ET AL.	
· ·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David M Brunsman `	1755	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriation or the final Office or the fina	ite extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	menter to apply	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:	• •		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:	,		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	, , , , , ,	10	
	. /	// Lun	
		David M Brunsman Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1755	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: with respect to the rejection under section 251, th examiner relies upon the arguments made in previous office actions, pausing only to note that the MPEP defines surrendered subject matter as made in response to a "rejection or objection" without limitation to the sections under which said rejection or objection is made.

Continuation of 10. Other: The treatment of the "non-priority PCT applications" is moot as they are no longer being relied upon as part of the prosecution history of the present application. With respect to the offer to dedicate claims to the public, it is deemed inappropriate at the time as there is no provision for it at this stage of the prosecution..